

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's submission filed on 07/09/2010.

Status of Claims

2. Currently, claims 1-17, 19, 20, 22, 26-41 are pending. Claims 18, 21, and 23-25 were previously canceled.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, with respect to the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejections of claims 39 and 40 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejections have been withdrawn.
4. Applicant makes the following arguments with respect to the 35 USC 103 rejections set forth in the previous action:

- a. "reserving a network interface location in advance of a meeting. . . is very different. . . from the present claimed invention which states "allocating network resources for said meeting after receiving said request to join said meeting from said first of said plurality of attendees,"" with respect to claims 1 and 31.

Remarks p.16

- b. "Semaan relate to reserving network resources for a conference and a quality parameter that includes desired bandwidth (as opposed to determining total required bandwidth for the meeting as recited)" with respect to claims 11, 31, and 40. Remarks p.18

c. "Claim 7 was previously amended to clarify that the first and second meetings cannot be sub-conferences of one another - all of the attendees at either of the first and second meetings are different from one another. This condition necessarily cannot be met by the "subconferencing" disclosed by Semaan." Remarks p. 21

d. A URL or web page is not an executable file, and even accepting for the sake of argument only that it might be considered an executable file, a URL / webpage cannot satisfy the claimed recitations of: "...that upon execution takes all steps necessary to connect to the virtual meeting," with respect to claim 14. Remarks p.22

Applicant's arguments (4a-4d), with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 7, 11, 14, 31, and 40 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection are made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 13, 14, 20, 22, 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1) in view of Bruno et al (US 5,784,561).**

7. Claims 1

Dailey teaches a method for organizing a virtual meeting between a pluralities of attendees on a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

- **(In Dailey fig. 5 and accompany text discloses)** selecting a meeting date **(Dailey fig. 5, #1448 & 1452)**, a meeting start time **(Dailey fig. 5, #1450)**, meeting duration **(Dailey fig. 5, #1454; where the end time implies duration)**, and a meeting code **(Dailey fig. 5, #1440; where the host's email serves as the meeting code see col. 3, lines 37-42)**, storing said meeting date, said meeting start time, said meeting duration, and said meeting code in a meeting file **(Dailey col. 3, lines 19-23 where information claimed is included in the stored request see fig. 5);**
- storing said meeting file in a memory accessible to the network **(Dailey col. 3, lines 19-23 and figs. 2A #1002; 3 #1204; 4 and accompanying text);**
- communicating a meeting invitation to said plurality of attendees over the network **(Dailey col. 7, lines 1-31; which describes the network connection and col. 11, lines 17-20)**, said invitation including at least said meeting date **(Dailey fig. 5, #1448 & 1452)**, said meeting start time **(Dailey fig. 5, #1450)**, said meeting code **(Dailey fig. 5, #1440; where the host's email serves as the**

meeting code see col. 3, lines 37-42), and a meeting entry portal (Dailey fig. 5 #1434 and col. 15 lines, 11-28)

- said network resources including at least one IP address (**Dailey col. 9, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 25-35**) and at least one port for a network interface connected to the network for connecting said plurality of attendees for communication with one another during the meeting (**Dailey col. 6, lines 56-60**)

Daily does not teach:

- receiving a request to join the meeting from a first of said plurality of attendees;
- allocating network resources for said meeting after receiving said request to join said meeting from said first of said plurality of attendees... said network resources sufficient to communicate a plurality of real time data streams over the network, said plurality of real time data streams including at least one real time video data stream and at least one real time audio data stream.

Bruno teaches in the analogous art of on-demand video conferencing:

- receiving a request to join the meeting from a first of said plurality of attendees (**Bruno abstract “at least one video conference control system that receives an on-demand request for a video conference from a user”**);
- allocating network resources for said meeting after receiving said request to join said meeting from said first of said plurality of attendees (**Bruno abstract “at least one video conference control system that receives an on-demand request for a video conference from a user and in real time allocates video conferencing resources” and fig. 4 with accompanying text**)... said network

resources sufficient to communicate a plurality of real time data streams over the network (**Bruno col. 2, lines 21-23**), said plurality of real time data streams including at least one real time video data stream (**Bruno col. 1, lines 53-55 and col. 3, lines 33-35**) and at least one real time audio data stream (**Bruno col. 1, lines 55-58 and col. 3, lines 33-35**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily the receiving a request to join the meeting from a first of said plurality of attendees and allocating network resources for said meeting after receiving said request to join said meeting from said first of said plurality of attendees... said network resources sufficient to communicate a plurality of real time data streams over the network, said plurality of real time data streams including at least one real time video data stream and at least one real time audio data stream as taught by Bruno since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

8. Claim 13

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and Daily further teaches wherein said meeting file further includes at least one application to be used during the meeting (**Dailey col. 3, lines 61-66 and fig. 5, #1442**).

9. Claim 14

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and Daily further teaches wherein said invitation is an executable file that upon execution takes steps necessary to connect to said virtual meeting (**Daily col. 3, lines 34-42**).

10. Claim 20

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 wherein said network resources include at least one network interface having an address (**Dailey col. 9, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 25-35**), and further including storing said at least one network interface address in said meeting file (**Daily col. 3, lines 37-42 and fig. 5, #1442**).

11. Claim 22

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and Bruno further teaches wherein the step of allocating said network resources for said meeting comprises selecting said network resources from a list of available network resources (**Bruno fig. 4 # S1006-S1016**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily the step of allocating said network resources for said meeting comprises selecting said network resources from a list of available network resources as taught by Bruno since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have

performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

12. Claim 26

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and Daily further teaches wherein said network resources include at least one network interface address (**Daily fig. 5, #12442, 1444**), and further including the step of storing said at least one network interface address in said meeting file (**Dailey col. 3, lines 19-23 where information claimed is included in the stored request see fig. 5**).

13. Claim 29

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and further including the step of providing a network address for each of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Daily col. 3, lines 53-56, col. 11, lines 52-57**).

14. Claim 30

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and Daily further teaches further including the steps of creating a pass key for entry to said meeting, of including said pass key with said invitation communicated to said plurality of attendees, and of storing said pass key in said meeting file (**Daily col. 3, lines 48-53**).

15. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1) and Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gupta et al (Resource sharing for multi-party real-time communication, 1995).

16. Claim 2

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1; however neither teaches including the step of determining a required bandwidth for the meeting and storing said required bandwidth in said meeting file.

Gupta teaches in an analogous art of multi-party real-time communication, including the step of determining a required bandwidth for the meeting and storing said required bandwidth in said meeting file (**Gupta col. 1, p. 1230 "they allocate network resources (e.g. bandwidth . . . when determining their resource requirements" where resources includes bandwidth.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the including the step of determining a required bandwidth for the meeting and storing said required bandwidth in said meeting file as taught by Gupta since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

17. Claim 3

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 wherein each of said plurality of meeting attendees will be streaming a plurality of real time data streams to the meeting (**Bruno col. 1, lines 53-55 and col. 3, lines 33-35**); however neither teaches and wherein the method further includes the step of determining the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily the wherein each of said plurality of meeting attendees will be streaming a plurality of real time data streams to the meeting as taught by Bruno since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Gupta teaches wherein the method further includes the step of determining the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams (**Gupta col. 1, p. 1230 "they allocate network resources (e.g. bandwidth . . . when determining their resource requirements" where resources includes bandwidth)**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the wherein the method further includes the step of determining the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams as taught by Gupta since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have

performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

18. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561), and Gupta et al (Resource sharing for multi-party real-time communication, 1995) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Semaan (US 5,680,392).

19. Claim 4

Daily, Bruno and Gupta teach the method as defined by claim 3; however none teach further including the step of determining the total bandwidth required for the virtual meeting by summing the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams from each of said plurality of attendees.

Semaan teaches in an analogous art, further including the step of determining the total bandwidth required for the virtual meeting by summing the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams from each of said plurality of attendees (**Semaan col. 8, line 65—col.9, line 28**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Bruno and Gupta step of determining the total bandwidth required for the virtual meeting by summing the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams from each of said plurality of attendees as taught by Semaan since the claimed invention is merely a

combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

20. Claim 5

Daily, Bruno, Gupta and Semaan teach the method as defined by claim 4 wherein said plurality of real time data streams includes at least a plurality of video data streams and at least one audio data stream (**Bruno col. 1, lines 53-55 and col. 3, lines 33-35**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Gupta and Semaan step of determining the plurality of real time data streams includes at least a plurality of video data streams and at least one audio data stream as taught by Bruno since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

21. **Claims 6, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gorsuch et al (US 6,526,281 B1) and Etorre (US 6,594,265).**

22. Claim 6

Daily and Bruno teach the method as defined by claim 1 and however neither teaches further including the steps of determining the total bandwidth available to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees through consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated to the virtual meeting will be carried over a linkage connecting said each of said plurality of attendees to the virtual meeting.

Gorsuch teaches the steps of determining the total bandwidth available to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees (**Gorsuch col. 10, lines 23-26**);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the steps of determining the total bandwidth available to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees as taught by Gorsuch since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

However Gorsuch does not teach through consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated to the virtual meeting will be carried over a linkage connecting said each of said plurality of attendees to the virtual meeting

Etorre teaches through consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated to the virtual meeting will be carried over a linkage connecting said each of said plurality of attendees to the virtual meeting (**Etorre col. 25, lines 19-28**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Dailey and Bruno the consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated to the virtual meeting will be carried over a linkage connecting said each of said plurality of attendees to the virtual meeting by Etorre since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

23. Claim 9

Daily, Bruno, Gorsuch and Etorre teach the method as defined by claim 6 and further including the steps of:

- determining what linkage each of said plurality of attendees is connected to the network with (**Dailey fig. 2A & 2B**); and
- determining whether any additional of said plurality of attendees are connected to the network over said linkage (**Dailey fig. 2A & 2B**).

24. Claim 10

Daily, Bruno, Gorsuch and Etorre teach the method as defined by claim 6 wherein the virtual meeting is the first virtual meeting and further including the steps of:

- determining what linkage each of said plurality of attendees is connected to the network with (**Dailey fig. 2A & 2B**);

Daily does not teach, but Gorsuch does

- determining whether any other virtual meetings are occurring at least partially concurrently with the first virtual meeting, wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another (**Gorsuch col. 10, lines 23-26**); and,

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Bruno, and Etorre the determining whether any other virtual meetings are occurring at least partially concurrently with the first virtual meeting, wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another as taught by Gorsuch since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Gorsuch does not teach, but Etorre does

- determining whether any attendees of any of said other virtual meetings are connected to the network over said linkage (**Etorre col. 20, lines 19-28**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Bruno, and Gorsuch the determining whether any attendees of any of said other virtual meetings are connected to the network over said linkage as taught by Etorre since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely

would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

25. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) Gorsuch et al (US 6,526,281 B1) and Etorre (US 6,594,265) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Gupta et al (Resource sharing for multi-party real-time communication, 1995).

26. Claim 7

Daily, Bruno, Gorsuch and Etorre teach the method as defined by claim 6 wherein the virtual meeting is a first virtual meeting (**Daily col. 10, lines 7-8**); however Daily does not teach, and wherein the step of determining the total bandwidth to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees includes determining whether a second virtual meeting may consume bandwidth resources of said attendee, and wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another.

Gorsuch teaches wherein the step of determining the total bandwidth to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees (**Gorsuch col. 10, lines 23-26**) however does not teach includes determining whether a second virtual meeting may consume bandwidth resources of said attendee, and wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Bruno, and Etorre the step of determining the total bandwidth to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees as taught by Gorsuch since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Gupta teaches determining whether a second virtual meeting may consume bandwidth resources of said attendee, and wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another (**Gupta p. 1231, fig. 1**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Bruno, Gorsuch and Etorre the a second virtual meeting may consume bandwidth resources of said attendee, and wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another as taught by Gupta since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

27. Claim 8

Daily, Bruno, Gorsuch, Etorre and Gupta teach the method as defined by claim 7 wherein at least one of said plurality of attendees is linked to the network by a linkage

shared by an attendee of said second virtual meeting, said second virtual meeting being at least partially concurrent with said first virtual meeting(**Gupta p. 1231, fig. 1**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Bruno, Gorsuch and Etorre the at least one of said plurality of attendees is linked to the network by a linkage shared by an attendee of said second virtual meeting, said second virtual meeting being at least partially concurrent with said first virtual meeting as taught by Gupta since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

28. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US 6,363,352 B1) and Bruno et al (US 5,784,561), and as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gupta et al (Resource sharing for multi-party real-time communication, 1995) and Semaan (US 5,680,392).

29. Claim 12

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1, but do not teach further including the steps of, which Semaan does teach

- determining the total required bandwidth for the meeting, of determining the total available bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees (Semaan col. 8, line 65—col.9, line 28).

Semaan does not teach, but Gupta does

- and of directing any attendees that do not have sufficient bandwidth available to link to a subset of said plurality of data streams being communicated during the meeting (Gupta p.1231, col. 2 bullet 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Dailey, Bruno and Semaan step of directing any attendees that do not have sufficient bandwidth available to link to a subset of said plurality of data streams being communicated during the meeting as taught by Gupta since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

30. Claims 15-17 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Semaan (US 5,680,392).

31. Claim 15

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 however neither teaches wherein said meeting file further specifies a display template for displaying video streams during the meeting.

Semaan teaches in the analogous art of multipoint telecommunications wherein said meeting file further specifies a display template for displaying video streams during the meeting (**Semaan col. 9, lines 10-27**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the wherein said meeting file further specifies a display template for displaying video streams during the meeting as taught by Semaan since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

32. Claim 16

Daily, Bruno and Semaan teach a method as defined by claim 15 and Semaan further teaches wherein said display template includes application geometry for displaying images (**Semaan col. 9, lines 10-27**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the wherein said display template includes application geometry for displaying images as taught by Semaan since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the

Art Unit: 3623

combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

33. Claim 17

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 however neither teaches and further including the step of selecting a display template for displaying at least one video data stream during the meeting.

Semaan teaches in the analogous art of multipoint telecommunications including the step of selecting a display template for displaying at least one video data stream during the meeting (**Semaan col. 9, lines 10-27**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the including the step of selecting a display template for displaying at least one video data stream during the meeting as taught by Semaan since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

34. Claim 38

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and however neither teaches further including the steps of determining the IP address of each of said

plurality of meeting attendees, and of limiting said meeting attendees to only those having an IP address listed in said meeting file.

Semaan teaches the steps of determining the IP address of each of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Semaan col. 3, lines 19-23**), and of limiting said meeting attendees to only those having an IP address listed in said meeting file (**Semaan col. 8, lines 51-56**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Dailey and Bruno the determining the IP address of each of said plurality of meeting attendees, and of limiting said meeting attendees to only those having an IP address listed in said meeting file as taught by Semaan since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

35. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gorsuch et al (US 6,526,281 B1)

36. Claim 19

Daily and Bruno teach the method as defined by claim 1 however neither teaches and further including the steps of linking each remaining of said plurality of users to said meeting resources when a request for entry is received from said remaining of said plurality of users.

Gorsuch teaches further including the steps of linking each remaining of said plurality of users to said meeting resources when a request for entry is received from said remaining of said plurality of users (**Gorsuch fig. 5 and col. 8, lines 49-67**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the steps of linking each remaining of said plurality of users to said meeting resources when a request for entry is received from said remaining of said plurality of users as taught by Gorsuch since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

37. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Haims (US Publication 2003/0105820 A1)

38. Claim 27

Daily and Bruno teach the method as defined by claim 1; however neither teaches wherein said meeting entry portal is a URL and wherein said network interface location is different from said meeting entry portal URL.

Hamis teaches in the analogous art of facilitating communication, said meeting entry portal is a URL and wherein said network interface location is different from said meeting entry portal URL (**Haims par.94**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the meeting entry portal is a URL and wherein said network interface location is different from said meeting entry portal URL as taught by Hamis since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

39. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Blinken et al. (U.S. 4,796,293) and Official Notice.

40. Claim 28

Daily and Bruno teach the method as defined by claim 1 however neither teaches further including the step of specifying an early join time before said start time before

which said at least one attendee cannot join the meeting and a late time after which said at least one attendee cannot join the meeting.

Blinken et al. discloses that "latecomers" will not be able to join a conference after a certain amount of time has expired (**Blinken col. 7, lines 18-21**).

Additionally, Examiner takes Official Notice that specifying an early join time before a start time before which an attendee cannot join a meeting is an old and well known function of scheduling online/virtual meetings.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the online conference scheduling system of Daily and Bruno with the features taught by Blinken et al. and Official Notice because the invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

41. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Blinken et al. (U.S. 4,796,293).

42. Claim 39

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and further including the steps of creating a pass key for entry to said meeting (**Daily col. 3, lines 48-53**);

however neither Daily and Bruno teaches sending said pass key to said plurality of attendees in a communication separate from said meeting invitation communication.

Blinken teaches in an analogous art sending said pass key to said plurality of attendees in a communication separate from said meeting invitation communication
(Blinken col. 13, lines 1-14)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the sending said pass key to said plurality of attendees in a communication separate from said meeting invitation communication as taught by Blinken since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

43. Claims 11 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hales et al (US Patent 6,288,739 B1).

44. Claim 11

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and; however neither teaches further including the steps of determining the total bandwidth of each of said

plurality of meeting attendees and of limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate in said meeting.

Hales teaches in the analogous art of distributed video communication the steps of determining the total bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Hales col. 7, lines 29-40 & 51-56**) and of limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate in said meeting (**Hales col. 16, lines 30-38 and 51-53**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the steps of determining the total bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees and of limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate in said meeting as taught by Hales since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

45. Claim 40

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and however neither teaches further including the steps of:

- receiving a request to join the meeting from a second and third of said plurality of meeting attendees;

- determining that said second and third of said plurality of meeting attendees have sufficient bandwidth available to attend said meeting, and connecting said second and third of said plurality of attendees to said meeting wherein said second and third attendees share said plurality of real time data streams with one another and said first of said plurality of meeting attendees;
- receiving a request to join the meeting from a fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees; and
- determining that said fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees does not have sufficient bandwidth available to attend said meeting, and denying admission to said fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees.

Hales teaches in the analogous art of distributed video communication the steps of:

- receiving a request to join the meeting from a second and third of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Hales col. 10, lines 28-35 & 41-46**);
- determining that said second and third of said plurality of meeting attendees have sufficient bandwidth available to attend said meeting (**Hales col. 7, lines 29-40 & 51-56 and col. 8, lines 32-38**), and connecting said second and third of said plurality of attendees to said meeting wherein said second and third attendees share said plurality of real time data streams with one another and said first of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Hales col. 10, lines 34-35, 53-54 and fig. 3**);

- receiving a request to join the meeting from a fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Hales col. 10, lines 28-35 & 41-46**); and
- determining that said fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees does not have sufficient bandwidth available to attend said meeting(**Hales col. 7, lines 29-40 & 51-56 and col. 8, lines 32-38**), and denying admission to said fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Hales col. 16, lines 30-38 and 51-53**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the features as taught by Hales since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

46. Claim 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gupta et al (Resource sharing for multi-party real-time communication, 1995) Semaan (US 5,680,392) and Hales et al (US Patent 6,288,739 B1).

47. Claim 41

Daily and Bruno teach a method as defined by claim 1 and however neither teaches further including the steps of:

- determining the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of attendees wherein each of said plurality of meeting attendees will be streaming a plurality of real time data streams to the meeting
- determining the total bandwidth required for the virtual meeting by summing the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams from each of said plurality of attendees;
- determining if each of said plurality of meeting attendees has sufficient bandwidth available to attend said meeting; and
- directing any attendees that do not have sufficient bandwidth available to link to a subset of said plurality of data streams being communicated during the meeting.

Semaan teaches in an analogous art:

- determining the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of attendees wherein each of said plurality of meeting attendees will be streaming a plurality of real time data streams to the meeting (**Semaan col. 8, line 65—col.9, line 28**);
- determining the total bandwidth required for the virtual meeting by summing the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams from each of said plurality of attendees (**Semaan col. 8, line 65—col.9, line 28**);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the feature as taught by Semaan since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Semaan does not teach, but Hales does teach in an analogous art:

- determining if each of said plurality of meeting attendees has sufficient bandwidth available to attend said meeting (**Hales col. 7, lines 29-40 & 51-56 and col. 8, lines 32-38**);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Bruno and Semaan the feature as taught by Hales since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Semaan and Hales do not teach, but Gupta teaches in an analogous art

- directing any attendees that do not have sufficient bandwidth available to link to a subset of said plurality of data streams being communicated during the meeting (**Gupta p.1231, col. 2 bullet 3**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Bruno, Semaan and Hales the

feature as taught by Gupta since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

48. Claims 31, 32, 34, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1) in view of Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) and Hales et al (US Patent 6,288,739 B1).

49. Claim 31

Daily teaches a computer program product for organizing a virtual meeting between a plurality of attendees on a computer network, the program product including computer executable instructions stored on a computer readable medium that when executed cause the computer to:

- receive a meeting code (Dailey col. 3, lines 51-55 and fig. 5, #1440), a meeting date (Dailey fig. 5, #1448 & 1452), a meeting start time (Dailey fig. 5, #1450), and the identity of a plurality of meeting attendees from a user submitted over the network (Dailey col. 7, lines 1-31 and col. 11, lines 17-20 & 52-57);
- store said meeting code, said meeting start time, and said identity of said plurality of meeting attendees in a meeting file in a memory accessible to

the network (**Dailey col. 3, lines 19-23 and figs. 2A #1002; 3 #1204; 4 and accompanying text**);

- communicate an invitation to each of said plurality of meeting attendees, said invitation including at least said meeting start time, said meeting code, and an entry portal for entering the meeting (**Dailey fig. 5, col. 7, lines 1-31; and col. 11, lines 17-20**);
- allocating at least one IP address (**Dailey col. 9, lines 15-35 and col. 10, lines 25-35**) and at least one port linked to a network interface location for the meeting...storing said at least one network interface location in said meeting file(**Dailey col. 6, lines 56-60**),

Daily does not teach

- receive a first request to enter the meeting from a first of said plurality of meeting attendees after said first attendee has connected to said entry portal, ... after receiving said first request, said at least one network interface location sufficient to link a plurality of real time video streams and at least one real time audio stream between each of said plurality of meeting attendees...linking said first meeting attendee to said network interface;
- receiving a subsequent request from a second of said plurality of meeting attendees, and linking said second meeting attendee to said network location; and

- determining the total bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees, and limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate in said meeting.

Bruno teaches in the analogous art of on-demand video conferencing:

- receive a first request to enter the meeting from a first of said plurality of meeting attendees after said first attendee has connected to said entry portal (**Bruno abstract “at least one video conference control system that receives an on-demand request for a video conference from a user”**), ...after receiving said first request, said at least one network interface location sufficient to link a plurality of real time video streams (**Bruno col. 1, lines 53-55 and col. 3, lines 33-35**) and at least one real time audio stream between each of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Bruno col. 1, lines 55-58 and col. 3, lines 33-35**) . . . linking said first meeting attendee to said network interface (**Bruno col. 6, lines 55-59**);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily the feature as taught by Bruno since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Bruno does not teach:

- receiving a subsequent request from a second of said plurality of meeting attendees, and linking said second meeting attendee to said network location; and
- determining the total bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees, and limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate in said meeting.

Hales teaches in the analogous art of distributed video communications:

- receiving a subsequent request from a second of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Hales col. 10, lines 28-35 & 41-46**) and linking said second meeting attendee to said network location (**Hales col. 10, lines 34-35, 53-54 and fig. 3**);
- determining the total bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees, and limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate in said meeting(**Hales col. 7, lines 29-40 & 51-56 and col. 8, lines 32-38**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the feature as taught by Hales since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

50. Claim 32

Daily, Bruno and Hales teach a computer program product as defined by claim 31 and Dailey further teaches wherein said invitation comprises an executable file that when executed performs steps sufficient to connect said each of said plurality of attendees to said virtual meeting (**Daily col. 3, lines 34-42**).

51. Claim 34

Daily, Bruno and Hales teach a computer program product as defined by claim 31 and Hales further teaches wherein the program instructions further cause the computer to determine the total bandwidth required to participate in said meeting, and the bandwidth available to communicate with each of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Hales col. 7, lines 29-40 & 51-56 and col. 8, lines 32-38**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the program instructions further cause the computer to determine the total bandwidth required to participate in said meeting, and the bandwidth available to communicate with each of said plurality of meeting attendees as taught by Hales since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

52. Claim 35

Daily, Bruno and Hales computer program product as defined by claim 31 and Hales further teaches wherein the program instructions when executed further cause the computer to determine the bandwidth resources for each of said plurality of meeting attendees (**Hales col. 7, lines 29-31**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the program instructions when executed further cause the computer to determine the bandwidth resources for each of said plurality of meeting attendees as taught by Hales since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

53. Claim 36

Daily, Bruno and Hales teach a computer program product as defined by claim 35 wherein the product is for organizing a plurality of different meetings (**Dailey abstract; this limitation is being interpreted by the Examiner as a statement of intended use. As such the limitation is not given any patentable weight in keeping with the guidelines of MPEP 7.37.09**), wherein said meeting is a first meeting (**Daily abstract**), and wherein the program instructions cause the computer to determine what linkage connects each of said plurality of attendees to the network with (**Daily fig. 2A and 2b**), and

Daily does not teach whether said linkage is shared by any other of said plurality of attendees or shared by attendees of a different second meeting occurring concurrently with said first meeting.

Hales teaches said linkage is shared by any other of said plurality of attendees or shared by attendees of a different second meeting occurring concurrently with said first meeting (**Hales fig. 13A and 13B and accompanying text**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily and Bruno the linkage is shared by any other of said plurality of attendees or shared by attendees of a different second meeting occurring concurrently with said first meeting as taught by Hales since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

54. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey et al (US Patent 6,363,352 B1), Bruno et al (US 5,784,561) and Hales (US 6,288,739) as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Semaan (US 5,680,392).

55. Claim 33

Daily, Bruno and Hales teach a computer program product as defined by claim 31 however none of which teach wherein the program instructions further cause the computer to receive a display template selection, said display template including at least a specified display location and size for at least one video stream, and to use said display template during the meeting.

Semaan teaches in the analogous art of multipoint telecommunications wherein the program instructions further cause the computer to receive a display template selection (**Semaan col. 9, lines 10-27**), said display template including at least a specified display location and size for at least one video stream, and to use said display template during the meeting (**Semaan col. 9, lines 10-27**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily, Bruno and Hales the wherein said display template includes application geometry for displaying images as taught by Semaan since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

56. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daily (US 6,363,352 B1) in view of Hales (US 6,288,739).

57. Claim 37

Hales teaches a method for determining the bandwidth resources for attendees of a virtual meeting conducted over a network, including the steps of:

determining what attendees will attend at least a first and a second meeting
(Daily fig. 5 # 1424 and accompanying text; where it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that steps describe are repeatable for x number of meetings)

Dailey does not teach
wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another;
determining what linkages each of said attendees of each of said at least a first and a second meetings is connected to the network with; and
determining whether any of said linkages are shared linkages that are shared by attendees of different of said at least a first and second meetings that are occurring at least partially concurrently with one another, and if they are shared linkages determining what bandwidth is available over said shared linkage for each of said attendees of different meetings.

Hales teaches in the analogous art of distributed video communications:
wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another **(Hales col. 17, lines 60-67);**

determining what linkages each of said attendees of each of said at least a first and a second meetings is connected to the network with **(Hales fig. 13A & 13B);** and
determining whether any of said linkages are shared linkages that are shared by attendees of different of said at least a first and second meetings that are occurring at

least partially concurrently with one another, and if they are shared linkages determining what bandwidth is available over said shared linkage for each of said attendees of different meetings (**Hales col. 10, lines 34-35, 53-54 and fig. 3**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Daily the features as taught by Hales since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Conclusion

58. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hankejh et al (US 6,915,336 B1) teaches real time internet communications. Chang (US 6,922,718 B2) teaches bandwidth allocation during a multi-point video conference. Roy (US 6,081,513) teaches determining resource requirements. Hauris et al (US 5,422,883) teaches ad hoc conferencing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FOLASHADE ANDERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3331. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Folashade Anderson/
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Andre Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623